arXiv:1602.02069v1 [math.CO] 5 Feb 2016

Spectral properties of cographs

Ebrahim Ghorbani

Department of Mathematics, K.N. Toosi University of Technology,
P. O. Box 16315-1618, Tehran, Iran
School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM),
P.O. Box 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran

e_ghorbani@ipm.ir

February 8, 2016

Abstract

A cograph is a simple graph which contains no path on 4 vertices as an induced subgraph. We prove that a graph G is a cograph if and only if no induced subgraph of G has an (adjacency) eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$. It is also shown that the multiplicity of any eigenvalue of a cograph G does not exceed the sum of multiplicities of 0 and -1 as eigenvalues of G. Finally we introduce a partial order on the vertex set of graphs G in terms of inclusions among the open and closed neighborhoods of vertices, and conjecture that the multiplicity of any eigenvalue of a cograph G except for $0, -1$ does not exceed the maximum size of an antichain with respect to that partial order. In two extreme cases (in particular for threshold graphs), the conjecture is shown to be true.

Keywords: Cograph, Adjacency Matrix, Eigenvalue, Multiplicity, Threshold graph
AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 05C50, 05C75

1 Introduction

A cograph is a simple graph which contains no path on four vertices as an induced subgraph. The family of cographs is the smallest class of graphs that includes the single-vertex graph and is closed under complementation and disjoint union. Cographs were initially defined under different names [10, 11, 16, 18] and since then have been intensively studied. It is well known that any cograph has a canonical tree representation, called the cotree. This tree decomposition

scheme of cographs is a particular case of the modular decomposition [6] that applies to arbitrary graphs. Partly because of this property, cographs are interesting from algorithmic point of view (see [2]). Cographs have numerous applications in areas like parallel computing [13] or even biology [5] as they can be used to model series-parallel decompositions. For an account on different characterization and properties of cographs see [2].

Cographs have been also studied from algebraic point of view. Based on a computer search, Sillke [17] conjectured that the rank of the adjacency matrix of any cograph is equal to the number of distinct non-zero rows of that. The conjecture was proved by Royle [14]. Since then alternative proofs and extensions of this result were appeared [1, 4, 7, 15].

In this paper we explore further properties of the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of a cograph. We present a new characterization of cographs, namely a graph G is a cograph if and only if no induced subgraph of G has an eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$. We also show that the multiplicity of any eigenvalue of a cograph G does not exceed the total number of duplication and coduplication classes of G (see Section 2 for definition) which is not greater that the sum of multiplicities of 0 and -1 as eigenvalues of G. Our approach gives also a new proof for an extended version of Sillke's conjecture where we determine the multiplicities of 0 and -1 as eigenvalues of G. Finally we introduce a partial order on the vertex set of graphs G in terms of inclusions among the open and closed neighborhoods of vertices. We conjecture that the multiplicity of any eigenvalue of a cograph G except for $0, -1$ does not exceed the maximum size of an antichain with respect to that partial order. We prove the conjecture in two extreme cases: when all vertices are comparable with respect to the partial order (i.e. the graph is a threshold graph), and when no two vertices are comparable.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce notations and recall a basic result which will be used frequently. The graphs we consider are all simple and undirected. For a graph G, we denote by $V(G)$ the vertex set of G. The *order* of G is $|V(G)|$. For two vertices u, v, by $u \sim v$ we mean u and v are adjacent. If $V(G) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$, then the *adjacency matrix* of G is an $n \times n$ matrix $A(G)$ whose (i, j)-entry is 1 if $v_i \sim v_j$ and 0 otherwise. By *eigenvalues* and *rank* of G we mean those of $A(G)$. The multiplicity of an eigenvalue λ of G is denoted by $\mathrm{mult}(\lambda, G)$. For a vertex v of G, let $N_G(v)$ denote the *open neighborhood* of v, i.e. the set of all vertices of G adjacent to v and $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ denote the *closed neighborhood* of v; we will drop the subscript G when it is clear from the context. Two vertices u and v of G are called *duplicate* if $N(u) = N(v)$ and called *coduplicate* if $N[u] = N[v]$. We say that G is *reduced* (*coreduced*) if it has no pairs of duplicate (coduplicate) vertices. A subset S of $V(G)$ with $|S| > 1$ such that $N(u) = N(v)$ for any $u, v \in S$ and S being maximal with this property is called a *duplication class* of G. Coduplication classes are defined analogously.

An important subclass of cographs are *threshold graphs*. These are the graphs which are both

cograph and split (i.e. their vertex sets can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set). For more information see [2, 12].

We will make use of the interlacing property of graph eigenvalues which we recall below (see [3, Theorem 2.5.1]).

Lemma 1. *Let G be a graph of order n, H be an induced subgraph of G of order m, $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_m$ be the eigenvalues of G and H, respectively. Then*

$$\lambda_i \geq \mu_i \geq \lambda_{n-m+i} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

In particular, if $m = n - 1$, then

$$\lambda_1 \geq \mu_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_{n-1} \geq \mu_{n-1} \geq \lambda_n.$$

From the case of equality in interlacing (see [3, Theorem 2.5.1]) the following can be deduced.

Lemma 2. *If in Lemma 1, we have $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ or $\mu_i = \lambda_{n-m+i}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq m$, then $A(H)$ has an eigenvector $\mathbf{x}$ for μ_i, such that $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{pmatrix}$, where the $\mathbf{0}$ vector correspond to $V(G) \setminus V(H)$, is an eigenvector of $A(G)$ for the eigenvalue μ_i.*

3 A new characterization of cographs

Several characterizations are known for cographs [2]. In this section, we present a new characterization of cographs which is based on graph eigenvalues. We first state the following characterization of cographs which will be useful in the sequel (see [2, Theorem 11.3.3]).

Lemma 3. *A graph G is a cograph if and only if every induced subgraph of G with more than one vertices has a pair of duplicate or a pair of coduplicate vertices.*

Now we are in the position to state and prove our new characterization of cographs.

Theorem 4. *A graph G is a cograph if and only if no induced subgraph of G has an eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$.*

Proof. Among the graphs on four vertices, the 4-vertex path is the only one with an eigenvalue in the interval $(-1, 0)$ (see [3, p. 17]). This implies that if G has no induced subgraph on four vertices with an eigenvalue in $(-1, 0)$, then G is a cograph.

Conversely, assume that G is a cograph. Since any induced subgraph of a cograph is also a cograph, it suffices to prove the assertion for G itself. We proceed by induction on n, the order of G. The assertion holds if $n \leq 3$ as no graph with $n \leq 3$ vertices has an eigenvalue in $(-1, 0)$. Let

$n \geq 4$. By Lemma 3, G has either a pair of duplicates or a pair of coduplicates. First assume that G has a pair of duplicates u, v and $H = G - v$. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_{n-1}$ be the eigenvalues of G and H, respectively. Also suppose that $\mu_t > \mu_{t+1} = \cdots = \mu_{t+j} = 0 > \mu_{t+j+1}$ (with possibly $j = 0$). Since H is also a cograph, by the induction hypothesis, $\mu_{t+j+1} \leq -1$. By interlacing, we have $\lambda_{t+1} \geq 0 = \lambda_{t+2} = \cdots = \lambda_{t+j} = 0 \geq \lambda_{t+j+1} \geq \mu_{t+j+1}$. Note that in $A(G)$, the rows corresponding to u and v are the same, so G and H have the same rank which means that $\text{mult}(0, G) = \text{mult}(0, H) + 1 = j + 1$. This is possible only if both λ_{t+1} and λ_{t+j+1} are zero. On the other hand, again by interlacing, $\lambda_t \geq \mu_t > 0$ and $-1 \geq \mu_{t+j+1} \geq \lambda_{t+j+2}$. Hence G has no eigenvalue in $(-1, 0)$. If G has a pair of coduplicates u, v, the result follows similarly by considering the eigenvalue -1 and its multiplicity in both G and $G - v$. □

We remark that in [9] it was shown that threshold graphs (a subclass of cographs) have no eigenvalues in $(-1, 0)$.

4 Multiplicity of eigenvalues

This section is about eigenvalues multiplicities of a cograph. As an application of our new characterization of cographs, we determine the multiplicities of 0 and -1 eigenvalues of cographs in terms of the sizes of their (co)duplication classes. This in particular gives a new and short proof for the Sillke's conjecture. Moreover, it will be shown that for any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ of a cograph G, $\text{mult}(\lambda, G)$ does not exceed the total number of duplication and coduplication classes. This in turn implies that $\text{mult}(\lambda, G) \leq \text{mult}(0, G) + \text{mult}(-1, G)$.

We begin with the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5. *In cographs, any duplication class has no intersection with any coduplication class.*

Proof. Let G be a cograph and D, C be a duplication and a coduplication class of G, respectively, such that $v \in C \cap D$. So, there are $u \in C$ and $w \in D$ such that $N[u] = N[v]$ and $N(w) = N(v)$. As $u \neq v$, $u \in N(v) = N(w)$, which means $u \sim w$ and thus $v \sim w$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 6. *Let G be a cograph, C a duplication (couplication) class in G, $\emptyset \neq C' \subset C$, and $H = G \setminus C'$.*

(i) *If $|C'| \leq |C| - 2$, then any duplication (coduplication) pair in H, is a duplication (couplication) pair in G.*

(ii) *If $|C'| = |C| - 1$ and $C = C' \cup \{u\}$, then any duplication (coduplication) pair in H not containing u is a duplication (couplication) pair in G. Moreover, if C is a duplication class, then u does not have any duplicates in H and if C is a coduplication class, then u does not have any coduplicates in H.*

Proof. We assume that C is a duplication class, the proof of the other case is similar. To prove (i), let u, v be a duplication pair in H. If both u, v belong to $C \setminus C'$ or both do not belong to $C \setminus C'$, then obviously u, v are duplications in G. So we may assume that $u \in C \setminus C'$ and $v \notin C$ which means that $N_G(u) \neq N_G(v)$. As $N_H(u) = N_H(v)$, it turns out that there must be a $w \in C'$ such that $w \in N_G(v)$ (and of course $w \notin N_G(u)$). Since $|C \setminus C'| \geq 2$, there is a vertex z other than u in $C \setminus C'$. As z, w both belong to C, $N_G(w) = N_G(z)$, which implies $w \in N_H(v)$. This is a contradiction as $w \notin N_H(u) = N_H(v)$.

The first part of (ii) is again obvious. We prove the second part. Suppose that C is a duplication class and $v \notin C$ and $N_H(u) = N_H(v)$. Since $v \notin C$, $N_G(v) \neq N_G(u)$. It turns out that there must be a $w \in C'$ such that $w \in N_G(v)$, i.e. $v \in N_G(w) = N_G(u)$. This is a contradiction. □

Remark 7. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be an eigenvector for eigenvalue λ of a graph G. Then the entries of $\mathbf{x}$ satisfy the following equalities:

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}(v) = \sum_{u \sim v} \mathbf{x}(u), \quad \text{for all } v \in V(G).$$

From this it is seen that if $\lambda \neq 0$, then $\mathbf{x}$ is constant on each duplication class and if $\lambda \neq -1$, then $\mathbf{x}$ is constant on each coduplication class.

The following theorem which can be regarded as an application of Theorem 4 shows that in a cograph, the sizes of (co)duplication classes determine the multiplicities of 0 and -1 eigenvalues. This also can be viewed as a generalization of Sillke's conjecture.

Theorem 8. *Let G be a cograph, $C_1, \ldots, C_r$ and $D_1, \ldots, D_s$, with $r, s \geq 0$, be all the duplication and coduplication classes of G, respectively. Then*

$$\text{mult}(0, G) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} (|C_i| - 1), \quad \textit{and} \quad \text{mult}(-1, G) = \sum_{i=1}^{s} (|D_i| - 1).$$

In particular, if G is reduced, then G has no eigenvalue 0 and if G is coreduced, then G has no eigenvalue -1.

Proof. We prove the assertion for $\text{mult}(0, G)$, the other one is similar. We proceed by induction on the order of G.

First assume that G is not reduced with duplication classes $C_1, \ldots, C_r$. Let $u \in C_1$ and $G = H - u$. In the adjacency matrix of G, the rows corresponding to the vertices in C_1 are the same, so the adjacency matrix of G and H have the same rank which means that $\text{mult}(0, G) = \text{mult}(0, H) + 1$. If $|C_1| \geq 3$, then by Lemma 6 (i), $C_1 \setminus \{u\}, C_2, \ldots, C_r$ are all the duplication classes of H. So by the induction hypothesis,

$$\text{mult}(0, H) = (|C_1| - 2) + \sum_{i=2}^{r} (|C_i| - 1), \tag{1}$$

from which the result follows. If $|C_1| = 2$, then by Lemma 6 (ii), $C_2, \ldots, C_r$ are all the duplication classes of H, again (1) holds and the result follows.

Now, assume that G is reduced. Then by Lemma 3, G has a coduplcation class D. Let $u, v \in D$. Let $H = G - v$. First suppose that H has no duplications. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$ and $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_{n-1}$ be the eigenvalues of G and H, respectively. By the induction hypothesis, and in view of Theorem 4, we may assume that for some t, $\mu_t > 0 > -1 \geq \mu_{t+1}$. By interlacing, $\lambda_t \geq \mu_t \geq \lambda_{t+1} \geq \mu_{t+1}$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{mult}(-1, G) = \mathrm{mult}(-1, H) + 1$ which is possible only if $\lambda_{t+1} = -1$ (this can be seen by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4). This implies that G has no eigenvalue 0. Next suppose that H has some duplications. By Lemma 6 this is only possible if $|D| = 2$ in which case H has a unique duplication class $\{u, w\}$ for some vertex w. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathrm{mult}(0, H) = 1$. It is easily seen that $(1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0)^\top$ spans the null-space of H, where the first two coordinates correspond with u, w, respectively. If $\mathrm{mult}(0, G) \geq 1$, then by the equality case in interlacing, $\mathbf{x} = (0, 1, -1, 0, \ldots, 0)^\top$ is a null-vector for G, where the first coordinate corresponds with v. As any null-vector is constant on each coduplication class (by Remark 7), $\mathbf{x}$ must be constant on $D = \{v, u\}$ which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 9. *In a cograph, the multiplicity of any eigenvalue except for* $0, -1$ *does not exceed the total number of duplication and coduplication classes.*

Proof. Let G be a cograph and $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ be an eigenvalue of G. Let $R_1, \ldots, R_\ell$ be all the duplication and coduplication classes of G. Assume for a contradiction that $\mathrm{mult}(\lambda, G) > \ell$.

We claim that there is an eigenvector for λ which is zero on $R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_\ell$. To see this, from each class, we pick one vertex and remove them from G to obtain G'. At least $\ell + 1$ consecutive eigenvalues of G, say $\lambda_t, \ldots, \lambda_{t+\ell}$, are all equal to λ. Let $\mu_1 \geq \cdots \geq \mu_{n-\ell}$ be the eigenvalues of G'. By interlacing, $\lambda = \lambda_t \geq \mu_t \geq \lambda_{t+\ell} = \lambda$. So we have equality in interlacing. Then by Lemma 2, if $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ is an eigenvector of λ for G', then $\mathbf{x} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix}$ is an eigenvector of λ for G, where the $\mathbf{0}$ vector corresponds to the vertices we removed from G to obtain G'. Since any eigenvector for λ is constant on each (co)duplication class (by Remark 7), $\mathbf{x}$ must be zero on $R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_\ell$.

Again consider G where this time from each class, we keep one vertex $v_i \in R_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$ and remove the rest of vertices of R_i's. Let H_0 be the resulting graph. We claim that any (co)duplication class of H_0 contains some vertex from $\{v_1, \ldots, v_\ell\}$. To see this, consider $G_1 = G \setminus (R_1 \setminus \{v_1\})$. From Lemma 5 and 6 it follows that G_1 has ℓ or $\ell - 1$ (co)duplication classes and at least $\ell - 2$ of them are from $\{R_2, \ldots, R_\ell\}$. The possible new class is either of the form $\{v_1, u\}$ for some vertex $u \notin R_2 \cup \cdots \cup R_\ell$, or it is $R_j \cup \{v\}$ for some $2 \leq j \leq \ell$. (Note that in this case by Lemma 6, R_j is a coduplicate (dupliacte) class if R_1 is a duplicate (codupliacte) class.) By continuing this process after ℓ steps, we have removed

$$(R_1 \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup \cdots \cup (R_\ell \setminus \{v_\ell\}) \tag{2}$$

from G to obtain H_0. The above argument shows that at step i, if a new (co)duplication class is created, then it contains v_i. The claim now follows.

Suppose that $R'_1, \ldots, R'_{\ell'}$ are all the (co)duplication class of H_0. By some relabeling, we may assume that $v_i \in R'_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell'$. Note if we remove zero entries from an eigenvector of a graph and the corresponding vertices from the graph, the resulting vector is an eigenvector of the same eigenvalue for the resulting graph. Hence, if $\mathbf{x}_0$ is obtained from $\mathbf{x}$ by removing the entries corresponding with the vertices of (2), then $\mathbf{x}_0$ is an eigenvector of λ for H_0. Since $\mathbf{x}_0$ is zero on each v_i, and it is constant on each R'_i (by Remark 7), it must be zero on $R'_1 \cup \cdots \cup R'_{\ell'}$. Again we remove

$$(R'_1 \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup \cdots \cup (R'_{\ell'} \setminus \{v_{\ell'}\}) \tag{3}$$

from H_0 and call the resulting graph H_1. Again, with the same arguments as above, if $\mathbf{x}_1$ is obtained from $\mathbf{x}_0$ by removing the zero entries corresponding with the vertices of (3), then $\mathbf{x}_1$ is an eigenvector of λ for H_1. So far we have that $\mathbf{x}$ is zero on $V(G) \setminus V(H_1)$. Continuing this process we end up with some subgraph H_r which consists of some isolated vertices and we have that $\mathbf{x}$ is zero on $V(G) \setminus V(H_r)$, which implies that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction. □

With the notations of the above proof, by Theorem 8,

$$\mathrm{mult}(0, G) + \mathrm{mult}(-1, G) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (|C_i| - 1) \geq \ell.$$

So we have the following.

Corollary 10. *In any cograph G, the multiplicity of any eigenvalue does not exceed* $\mathrm{mult}(0, G) + \mathrm{mult}(-1, G)$.

5 Chain of neighborhoods

In this section we first introduce an equivalence relation on the vertices of a graph, and then on the set of equivalent classes, we introduce a partial order in terms of open/closed neighborhoods of vertices. We conjecture that the multiplicity of eigenvalues of the graph except for $0, -1$ is bounded from below by the maximum size of an antichain with respect to the partial order. We show that the conjecture is true on two extremal cases.

Let G be a graph and consider the following relation on $V(G)$:

$$u \equiv v \text{ if and only if } \begin{cases} N[u] = N[v] & \text{if } u \sim v, \\ N(u) = N(v) & \text{if } u \not\sim v. \end{cases}$$

Then '$\equiv$' is an equivalence relation on $V(G)$. It is trivially reflexive and symmetric. To check the transitivity, let $u \equiv v$ and $v \equiv w$. If either $u \sim v, v \sim w$ or $u \not\sim v, v \not\sim w$, then obviously $u \equiv w$. Hence, without loss of generality, we are left with the case $u \sim v, v \not\sim w$. Then

we have $N[u] = N[v]$ and $N(v) = N(w)$. So $u \in N(v) = N(w)$ which in turn implies that $w \in N[u] = N[v]$, which is a contradiction.

The equivalence relation '$\equiv$' partitions $V(G)$ into equivalence classes. In fact each equivalent class is either a set of a single vertex, or a (co)duplication class. We pick one representative from each equivalence class and denote the resulting set by $G/\equiv$. On $G/\equiv$ we define the following relation:

$$u < v \text{ if and only if } \begin{cases} N[u] \subset N[v] & \text{if } u \sim v, \\ N(u) \subset N(v) & \text{if } u \not\sim v, \end{cases}$$

or equivalently

$$u < v \text{ if and only if } N(u) \subset N[v].$$

We observe that '$<$' is partial order on $G/\equiv$. We only need to check the transitivity. Assume that $u < v$ and $v < w$. Again if either $u \sim v, v \sim w$ or $u \not\sim v, v \not\sim w$, then obviously $u < w$. Two cases are left to check. First, $u \not\sim v$ and $v \sim w$. So, we have $N(u) \subset N(v)$ and $N[v] \subset N[w]$, implying that $N(u) \subset N[w]$, i.e. $u < w$. Second, $u \sim v$ and $v \not\sim w$. So, we have $N[u] \subset N[v]$ and $N(v) \subset N(w)$. Hence, $u \in N(v) \subset N(w)$, and thus $w \in N(u) \subset N[v]$ which means $v \sim w$, a contradiction.

Now consider the chains and antichains of $G/\equiv$ with respect to the partial order '$<$'. Note that by Dilworth's theorem the minimum number of disjoint chains needed to partition $G/\equiv$ is equal to the maximum size of an antichain of $G/\equiv$. If $G/\equiv$ contains only antichains of size 1, then '$<$' is a total order, and all the elements of $G/\equiv$ belong to a chain, say $v_1 < v_2 < \cdots < v_r$. As the above argument shows $v_i \sim v_{i+1} \not\sim v_{i+2}$ is impossible for any i. So there must exist some $1 \leq j \leq r$ such that $v_1 \not\sim \cdots \not\sim v_j \sim \cdots \sim v_r$. It turns out that G is a split graph as the vertices equivalent with any of $v_1, \ldots, v_j$ form an independent set and the vertices equivalent with any of $v_{j+1}, \ldots, v_r$ form a clique. It is known that a split graph such that the neighborhoods of its vertices form a 'chain' as above, is a threshold graph (see [12, Theorem 1.2.4]).

Next result shows that when '$<$' is a total order on $G/\equiv$, i.e. $G/\equiv$ itself is chain, a strong constraint is imposed on eigenvalues multiplicities. We remark that this result was first proved in [8]. Here we give a simple proof for that.

Theorem 11. ([8]) *Let G be a threshold graph. Then any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$ is simple.*

Proof. Let v be the vertex with maximum degree in G so that any other vertex is adjacent to v. We show that if $\mathbf{x}$ is any eigenvector of λ, then $\mathbf{x}(v) \neq 0$. This proves the theorem since if $\text{mult}(\lambda, G) \geq 2$, we will have an eigenvector which is zero on v. For a contradiction, assume that $\mathbf{x}(v) = 0$. Therefore

$$0 = \lambda \mathbf{x}(v) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \mathbf{x}(u).$$

Since $\mathbf{x}(v) = 0$, By Remark 7, $\mathbf{x}(u) = 0$ for any $u \equiv v$. Let w be the largest (with respect to '$<$') vertex with $\mathbf{x}(w) \neq 0$. If w is not in the maximal clique K of G, then $\mathbf{x}$ is zero on K which

is only possible if $\lambda = 0$. Hence, $w \in K$ and

$$0 = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \mathbf{x}(u) = \mathbf{x}(w) + \sum_{u \sim w} \mathbf{x}(u).$$

On the other hand we have

$$\lambda \mathbf{x}(w) = \sum_{u \sim w} \mathbf{x}(u).$$

The above two equalities imply that $\lambda = -1$, a contradiction. □

In general we conjecture that there would be a relation between the chains in $G/\equiv$ and eigenvalues multiplicities.

Conjecture 12. *For any cograph G, the multiplicity of any eigenvalue $\lambda \neq 0, -1$, does not exceed the minimum number of chains with respect to the partial order '$<$' partitioning $G/\equiv$.*

As the concluding remark we note that Theorem 11 shows that the conjecture is true in the extreme case that $G/\equiv$ is a chain. In the other extreme that $G/\equiv$ is an antichain, the conjecture follows from Theorem 9.

Acknowledgments

The research of the author was in part supported by a grant from IPM. He is also indebted to Jack Koolen for fruitful discussion and critical remarks.

References

[1] T. Biyikoğlu, S.K. Simić, and Z. Stanić, Some notes on spectra of cographs, *Ars Combin.* **100** (2011), 421–434.

[2] A. Brandstädt, V.B. Le, and J.P. Spinrad, *Graph Classes: A Survey*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1999.

[3] A.E. Brouwer and W.H. Haemers, *Spectra of Graphs*, Springer, New York, 2012.

[4] G.J. Chang, L.-H. Huang, and H.-G. Yeh, On the rank of a cograph, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **429** (2008), 601–605.

[5] J. Gagneur, R. Krause, T. Bouwmeester, and G. Casari, Modular decomposition of protein-protein interaction networks, *Genome Biology* **5** (2004), R57.

[6] T. Gallai, Transitiv orientierbarer graphen, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar* **18** (1967), 25–66.

[7] L.-H. Huang, B.-S. Tam, and S.-H. Wu, Graphs whose adjacency matrices have rank equal to the number of distinct nonzero rows, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), 4008–4040.

[8] D.P. Jacobs, V. Trevisan, and F. Tura, Eigenvalue location in threshold graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **439** (2013), 2762–2773.

[9] D.P. Jacobs, V. Trevisan, and F. Tura, Eigenvalues and energy in threshold graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **465** (2015), 412–425.

[10] H.A. Jung, On a class of posets and the corresponding comparability graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Series B* **24** (1978), 125–133.

[11] H. Lerchs, On cliques and kernels, Technical Report, Dept. of Comp. Sci., Univ. of Toronto, 1971.

[12] N.V.R. Mahadev and U.N. Peled, *Threshold Graphs and Related Topics*, Annals of Discrete Mathematics **54**, NorthHolland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1995.

[13] K. Nakano, S. Olariu, and A. Zomaya, A time-optimal solution for the path cover problem on cographs, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **290** (2003), 1541–1556.

[14] G.F. Royle, The rank of a cograph, *Electron. J. Combin.* **10** (2003), Note 11.

[15] T. Sander, On certain eigenspaces of cographs, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15** (2008), Research Paper 140.

[16] D. Seinsche, On a property of the class of n-colorable graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Series B* **16** (1974), 191–193.

[17] T. Sillke, Graphs with maximal rank, `https://www.math.uni-bielefeld.de/~sillke/PROBLEMS/cograph`.

[18] D.P. Sumner, Dacey graphs, *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **18** (1974), 492–502.